

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,788	-	09/17/2003	Robert S. Schwartz	20220-502	6741
37374	7590	02/14/2006		EXAMINER	
INSKEEP 1	NTELLE	ECTUAL PROPER	SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD		
2281 W. 190	TH STRE	EET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 200				ARTUNII	PAPER NUMBER
TORRANCI	E. CA 90	0504		3738	

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\$78	?
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,788	SCHWARTZ ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bruce E. Snow	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION IN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may and will expire SIX (6) MONute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication (ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	January 2006		
•	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the merits is	S
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdreds 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2005 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) e drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Description Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	6) Other:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawing submitted 11/30/05 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said body lumen" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kensey et al (5,409,44, applicant cited on IDS 1/21/05) in view of Bouvier (WO 99/04832, applicant cited).

Kensey et al teaches a device comprising:

a sealed membrane including 202 forming an inner cavity,

Art Unit: 3738

a medium disposed in said inner cavity, said inner cavity having a portion sized for placement external to said body lumen 206 and a portion sized for placement internal 202 to said body lumen, said medium being movable between said internal and external portions in response to pressure fluctuations in said body lumen, thereby therapeutically dampening pressure fluctuations in the body lumen.

However, Kensey et al is silent regarding a media port. Bouvier teaches a similar compliance device including a port. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have included the port as taught by Bouvier on the compliance device of Kensey et al such the medium could be adjusted to best suit the patient.

Regarding claim 2, see element 208.

Kensey et al teaches the device using a gas and wherein the external portion 206 can be variable (which could except a liquid), however, fails to teach a using a liquid. Lacking any criticality in the specification the use of a liquid in lieu of that used by Kensey et al produces no advantage and is considered an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a liquid which is more compatible to the blood than a gas in case of failure.

Kensey et al teaches urethane but fails to teach silicone. Lacking any criticality in the specification the use of silicone produces no advantage and is considered an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of have silicone as a flexible biocompatible material (see column 4, lines 33-41 of Kensey et al) which is easily moldable and low priced.

Art Unit: 3738

Kensey et al fails to teach a coating of a biocompatible configuration. It would have been obvious to one skill in the art to have utilized a coating configuration on at least element 208 to increase sealing where the implant extends through the vessel wall.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E Snow whose telephone number is (703) 308-3255. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (703)308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bes

BRUCE SNOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4